

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet includes a change to Fig. 1 and replaces the original sheet inclusive of Fig. 1-2.

FIG. 1 -- insert numeral 16a.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (Figs. 1-2)

**REMARKS**

In response to the objections raised in the Final Rejection dated December 4, 2007, the sentence that had been inserted into page 12, lines 15-23 in the Amendment dated September 5, 2006 has been corrected to refer to the hydrophobic material "14". Also, Fig. 1 has been amended to insert numeral – 16a --.

Relating to the objections and rejections raised on pages 3 and 4 of the Final Rejection, the claims of the application have been amended to clarify the relationship of the hydrophobic and hydrophilic materials. For example, claim 34 recites that the user-facing liquid-pervious first side of the absorbent article comprises a first portion consisting of a hydrophobic material, and a second portion consisting of hydrophilic absorbent material. Thus, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 for example, the first side (the upper side in Fig. 2) comprises a first portion defined by hydrophobic layer 14 and a second portion defined by hydrophilic absorbent material 16 (which also defines a wetting region 15).

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims accurately reflect the nature of the invention which is fully consistent with the original specification, so no new matter has been introduced. Note that all of the language added by the prior Amendment describes readily apparent features of the originally disclosed article, which is permissible under the law.

Furthermore, it is submitted that the independent claims distinguish patentably over the applied prior art. That patent discloses an absorbent article having a liquid-pervious first side 102, but there is no disclosure of that side having both a first portion of hydrophobic material and a second portion which consists of hydrophilic

absorbent material as presently claimed. At column 5, lines 37-40, referenced by the Examiner, the top sheet 102 is described as hydrophobic; the word hydrophilic never appears. Rather, a hydrophilic material is apparently being inferred by the expression "surfactant-treated" without any evidence to demonstrate that a surfactant treated hydrophobic material is hydrophilic. Applicant disputes that inferred assumption. Nowhere is there any disclosure by Robinson that the portion of the first side to be first wetted should be hydrophilic material.

Furthermore, as regards claims 35, 30 and 40, there is no disclosure of the hydrophilic second portion being hump-shaped so as to project past the first portion in the direction of the user.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 4, 2007

By:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Alan E. Kopecki  
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620